Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Revised Request ☐

Application No.:__10/047248____   First Named Applicant:_____ Himmel
Examiner:_____Vu, Kieu D_____   Art Unit:_____ 2173   Status of Application:_Non-Final OA

Tentative

(1)____Mark   S.   Walker   (Atty   for   assignee)   (2)_____

(3)_____   (4)_____

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**
Participants:

AUG 1 1 2005

Proposed Date of Interview:_8/17/05_   Proposed Time:_2 PM EDT (AM/PM)
Type of Interview Requested:

(1) [X] Telephonic   (2) [ ] Personal   (3) [ ] Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [X] YES   [ ] NO
If yes, provide brief description:_____See attached proposed amendment to claim 1 _

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc)	Discussed Agreed Fig. #s	Prior Art		Not	Agreed
(1)__102 rej__	_____	_Shuster_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(2)__103 rej__	_____	_Shuster/Dorian	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(3)_____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(4)_____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:
Shuster does not teach each and every claimed element of amended claim. No motivation to combine Shuster and Dorian. Combination would be inoperable.   (see attached)

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.
NOTE:_____This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).
This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

_____   _____
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature   Examiner/SPE Signature

Mark S. Walker (Tel: 512-823-5884)
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative
30699
Registration Number, if applicable

Ser. No. 10/047248   Proposed Amendment   AUS92001122US1
Filed: 01/16/2002

Proposed Amendment

1. (Currently Amended) A method for managing web content displayed at a client device during one or more browser sessions comprising:

responsive to a request for a first web page, displaying the first web page at the client device through a browser session;

~~determining a first user specified timeout condition for said browser session:~~

detecting a timeout condition in the browser session; and

displaying a second ~~predetermined~~ user specified web page at the client device.

Discussion

This claim, as amended, is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited art. This claim 1 now includes elements similar to those in Claim 7 of the original application.

35 USC §102

This claim is patentable over Shuster because Shuster does not teach all elements of the claim. Shuster is directed to an advertising system that sends unsolicited material from a server when a user computer is inactive. The user has no control over the time or what is displayed and inclusion of those features would render Shuster inoperable for its intended purpose.

35 USC §103

Shuster and Dorian do not teach or suggest this claim either singly or in combination. Furthermore, there is no motivation to combine these references. Dorian is directed to a parental control system in which only preapproved web pages are displayed. . The preapproved list is stored on a server and controls which pages are downloaded to the client machine. Shuster is specifically directed to displaying unsolicited information on the client system. There is no motivation in add the preapproval features of Dorian since these would frustrate the purpose of Shuster to display unsolicited material. Similarly, since Dorian is directed at controlling what is displayed at the client, its purpose would be frustrated by permitting display of unsolicited content.